

1 DAVID A. ERICKSEN (State Bar No. 153923)  
 dae@severson.com  
 2 SEVERSON & WERSON  
 A Professional Corporation  
 3 One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600  
 San Francisco, California 94111  
 4 Telephone: (415) 398-3344  
 Facsimile: (415) 956-0439

5 PETER C. LYON (State Bar No. 174019)  
 6 pcl@severson.com  
 SEVERSON & WERSON  
 7 A Professional Corporation  
 1801 N. California Blvd., Suite 101  
 8 Walnut Creek, California 94596  
 Telephone: (925) 627-1910  
 9 Facsimile: (925) 932-3855

10

11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

12

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA — SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13

14 ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES GROUP,  
 INC., a California corporation; and IDEAS  
 15 CONSULTING, INC., a California  
 corporation,

Plaintiffs,

17

vs.

18

HKS, INC., a Texas corporation,

19

Defendant.

20

21 GEORGE LOISOS dba LOISOS  
 UBBELOHDE ASSOCIATES, an Individual,  
 22 SUSAN UBBELOHDE dba LOISOS +  
 UBBELOHDE ASSOCIATES, an individual,  
 23 and TIPPING MAR + ASSOCIATES, a  
 California corporation,

Third Party Defendants.

25

26

27

28

07465.0294/2529748.1

Case No. C-12-5787 SI

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
 ORDER FOR THIRD-PARTY  
 DEFENDANTS GEORGE LOISOS'S,  
 SUSAN UBBELOHDE'S, AND TIPPING  
 MAR + ASSOCIATES'S RESPONSES TO  
 HKS, INC.'S THIRD-PARTY  
 COMPLAINT**

1 Third-Party Defendants George Loisos and Susan Ubbelohde, dba Loisos + Ubbelohde  
2 Associates (collectively, “Loisos”), and Tipping + Mar Associates (“Tipping”) and Third-Party  
3 Plaintiff, HKS, Inc. (“HKS”) hereby stipulate as follows:

4 Whereas, the law firm of Severson & Werson will be representing Loisos and Tipping in  
5 this matter;

6 Whereas, both Loisos and Tipping have been named in HKS’s Third-Party Complaint in  
7 this matter (Doc. No. 22), and were planning to respond to that Third-Party Complaint on or  
8 before January 24, 2013;

9 Whereas on January 8, 2013, Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Architectural Resources  
10 Group, Inc. (“ARG”) filed a Motion to Dismiss or for More Definite Statement and Motion to  
11 Strike (Doc. No. 28) of HKS’s counter-claims, with hearing set for February 15, 2013 (herein, the  
12 “ARG Motion to Dismiss”);

13 Whereas, ARG Motion to Dismiss challenges the same pleading which alleges HKS’s  
14 claims against Loisos and Tipping;

15 Whereas, Loisos, Tipping and HKS believe that the Court’s ruling on the pending ARG  
16 Motion to Dismiss will also provide guidance with respect to the claims alleged against Loisos and  
17 Tipping, as set forth in HKS’s Third-Party Complaint (Doc. No. 22), and wish to effectuate a  
18 standstill with regard to their rights until after the Court’s ruling on the pending ARG Motion;

19 Whereas, the parties herein believe that this stipulation will avoid redundancy of motion  
20 practice and briefing on matters already before the Court with respect to HKS’s claims, thereby  
21 conserving judicial and party resources; and

22 Therefore, Loisos, Tipping and HKS hereby stipulate to the following:

23 (1) Loisos’s and Tipping’s time to respond to the HKS’ Third-Party Complaint will be  
24 extended as described immediately below;

25 (2) Following the Court’s ruling on ARG’s Motion to Dismiss, which is set to be heard  
26 February 15, 2013, Loisos and Tipping will have the same time as ARG to respond to either (a)  
27 HKS’s existing Third-Party Complaint if the ARG Motion to Dismiss is denied in full, or (b) to an

